Should the Board direct us to do so, County staff would be able implement the highlighted recommendations now.

For those not highlighted, staff requests 60 days to evaluate those recommendations and return to the Board.

Procedures and Training
1. Implement ongoing and consistent staff training to enable planners to recognize unnecessary steps.
2. Establish an ongoing training and mentoring program for employees. (8.1)[1]

Service First Initiative/Citygate Study
1. Customer service must be a top priority in the land development permitting process. (1)
2. Establish an ongoing customer service training program. (1.10)
3. Assign project managers to project applications early in the process and have them remain as the customer's go-to person on ALL aspects of the project through completion. (1.8)
4. Develop a LUEG-wide sense of urgency and timeliness of development processes; encourage, support and promote staff that embraces this philosophy. (1.12)
5. Eliminate multiple "bites of the apple" during the development review permitting process. (4.3) (A specific proposal for defining the scope of additional and subsequent reviews is defined in Attachment A.)
6. Complete the implementation of the new permitting system (Accela) and maintain the program. (1.13, 7)
7. Create a program manager level position to function as a problem-solver or troubleshooter. (10.7)

Incentives
1. Empower and reward those employees who demonstrate results within and across divisional and departmental lines. (3.6)
2. Look for ways to provide additional performance incentives for staff recognition (e.g., processing a project quickly and taking it to a decision-making body).

Organizational Structure
1. Organize [the departments] around the development review permitting process, rather than within the historical silos. (10)
2. Combine DPW Land Development with DPLU and create a new unified department. (10.1)

---

[1] The numbers in parentheses following the recommendations indicate the number of the same recommendation in the *Functional and Organizational Analysis of the Department of Planning and Land Use prepared by Citygate Associates, LLC.*

3. Transfer the DPW Transportation Planning and Traffic Engineering functions, DEH Land Development functions and DPR Land Development functions into the new unified department.
4. Empower the project manager to make decisions. (Similar to 3.2)

Land Use Jurisdictions
1. Do not require approvals from other local land use jurisdictions during project processing or in project conditioning.

Project Processing and Conditioning
1. Omit from project processing requirements and discretionary approvals/permits conditions of approval that require permittees to obtain specified permits from outside agencies or provide documentation from those specified agencies that the permits are not required. Although it is not necessary, the County may include a written notice in each discretionary approval/permit such as the following notice provided by the City of San Diego in its approvals/permits: "Issuance of this Permit by the City of San Diego does not authorize the Permittee for this permit to violate any Federal, State or City laws, ordinances, regulations or policies including but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.)."

Metrics
1. Performance measures need to address project timelines, not just the tasks of individual employees.
2. Reduce "task-centric" focus on metrics. Increase focus on project completion or "end-game" metrics. (Similar to 6.1 and 6.3)

Continuous Improvement
1. Fund a Continuous Improvement Program to ensure that the Service First Recommendations are being continuously implemented.
2. The Board of Supervisors should appoint an external "Audit Committee" to review the performance of the departments involved with development review permitting against the recommendations in the Service First Initiative and this report.
   a. The "Audit Committee" should be comprised of members of the public with experience in land use and land development.
   b. The new department involved with development review permitting should use clear, ongoing, verifiable performance standards (developed in conjunction with the "Audit Committee") to ensure that the major recommendations are being implemented with focus on project completion.
   c. The "Audit "Committee" shall meet two or three times per year and report their findings and any follow-up recommendations back to the Board of Supervisors.

Community Planning/Sponsor Groups
Modify the existing Planning Group structure to either:

1. Remove Community Planning and Sponsor Groups (CPGs) from the County's 'umbrella' and rescind Board Policy I-1; and
   - Require applicants for discretionary projects to prepare a Public Participation Plan (PPP) to inform residents of the community of the proposed project. The PPP shall be required for the following projects: TPM's, TM's, MUP's, Rezones, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments or other similar permit types. The PPP shall include one publicly noticed community meeting to be held in the community.

   -OR-

2. Leave CPGs under the County's 'umbrella' with the following changes:
   - Limit the scope of their review to the preparation and amendment of the General Plan and Community Plan and the PPP as described below.
   - Staff each CPG meeting with a senior level planner and County Counsel.
   - Institute term limits on CPG members to a maximum of two, two-year terms, in a ten year period.
   - Limit the number of CPG members for each group to seven.
   - Revise Board Policy I-1 to reflect the changes listed herein.
   - Revise the Fee Ordinance to clarify that CPG's no longer receive free appeals to the Board of Supervisors.
   - Require applicants for discretionary projects to prepare a Public Participation Plan (PPP) to inform residents of the community of the proposed project. The PPP shall be required for the following projects: TPM's, TM's, MUP's, Rezones, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments or other similar permit types. The PPP shall include one publicly noticed community meeting to be held in the community.

Self Certification
1. Allow licensed professionals to "self-certify" their drawings and submittals as appropriate to their license classification and professional registration for private improvements.

Cost Control
1. Except for applicant originated changes, establish reasonable, not-to-exceed costs for discretionary plan review. (This is similar to how a private sector land use consultant would establish charges for their services.)

Condition Timing
1. Revise the timing for condition satisfaction and mitigation. Utilize Accela to allow for condition satisfaction to occur at the latest point possible (e.g., permit approval, concurrent with actual impact, prior-to-occupancy). Establish a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program wherein all mitigation required for a particular project will be located in one place, including phasing, if any.

Off Map Conditioning
1. Record all possible items on the map (as opposed to off-map by separate document) unless there is a specific legal requirement that recordation be done by separate document.

Stormwater Priority Projects
1. Review stormwater requirements with respect to what constitutes a "priority project" and where possible, provide options to keep smaller, lower-risk projects out of the priority designation.

Residential Design Guidelines
1. Do not adopt the additional, new residential design guidelines as currently proposed.

Resource Protection Ordinance
1. Rely upon existing local, state and federal laws and eliminate the RPO.

EIR Risk Assumption Finding
1. In exchange for appropriate indemnification, allow project applicants to decide whether to include additional information or make additional revisions to an EIR, once the EIR meets reasonable standards.

General Recommendations
1. Applicants should not be required to submit applications or studies not otherwise required by written policy.
2. Consider outsourcing or managed competition for smaller, more routine discretionary permit processing and plan review functions.
3. Development standards enforced via local County ordinances should be subject to the vesting provisions of the Map Act (i.e. grandfathering).
4. Continue to shift as many project approvals as possible to ministerial, through projects such as the Tiered Wineries Ordinance.
5. The County should support CEQA reform efforts through its legislative program, California State Association of Counties and the California Legislature.